

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7 and 15 have been amended to replace “wherein when m is not zero” with “wherein when m is 2, 3, 4 or 5.” Support for this amendment exists throughout the present specification.

Also, the definition of “Y” in claim 1 has been amended from “an unsubstituted, linear or branched C₁₁-C₂₀ alkylene or alkenylene chain” to “a di (C₅-C₇) alkylethylene or di (C₅-C₇) alkylpropylene chain.” Support for this amendment exists throughout the present specification, for example at page 9, lines 1-3.

Claims 1-19 are currently pending.

The Office Action rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, asserting that (1) method claims 14-19 are not enabled for treating wrinkles, particularly with respect to the secondary agents identified in claim 14; (2) method claims 14-19 do not require application of any specific amount of the claimed secondary agents; and (3) claims 1-19 are indefinite because when m=1, R1 cannot be identical or different. In view of the following comments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Regarding (3), Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments to claims 1, 7 and 15 have rendered this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Regarding (1) and (2), claims 15-19 do not depend from claim 14. Given the Office Action’s basis for the § 112, first paragraph rejections of these claims which emphasizes the secondary agents in claim 14, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-19 should not have been rejected on these grounds. At any rate, method claims 15-19 merely require application of the claimed compound or composition to wrinkles. The present application is

enabling for such methods: that is, based on the disclosure in the present application, one skilled in the art would be able to apply the claimed compounds or compositions to wrinkles. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph of claims 15-19.

With respect to claim 14, this claim is directed to a composition, not a method. Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art, given the disclosure in the present application and the knowledge concerning the claimed secondary agents at the time the present application was filed, would have been able to produce a composition in which he combined the novel amine compounds of the present invention with the other known agents identified in claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Finally, Applicants respectfully request consideration and an indication of consideration of reference AW identified on PTO Form 1449 submitted November 6, 2003. For the Examiner's convenience, a duplicate copy of the Form 1449 is submitted herewith.


Application No: 10/701,466

Response to Office Action dated January 11, 2007

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Jeffrey B. McIntyre
Registration No. 36,867

Customer Number

22850

Tel #: (703) 413-3000

Fax #: (703) 413-2220